DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 356 SP 011 251

AUTHOR Frost, Joe L.
TITLE Educating Teachers for the 1980's: Toward a New School.
PUB DATE Jan 77
NOTE 17p.; Keynote address, Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (57th, Atlanta, Georgia, January 31, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; *Educational Alternatives; Educational Change; Educational Development; *Educational Innovation; Educational Needs; *Futures (of Society); Program Development; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

In this address, the author speculates upon the current status of teacher education, reflects upon the knowledge currently available from research and theory, and proposes a new system of cooperation between teacher educators and teachers in the role of educating children. Comments are made upon the lessons learned during the 1950's and 1960's from a blind obedience to science and the subsequent moral awakening due to Vietnam and to Watergate. Results of research into the efficacy of educational innovations proposed during the last twenty years are cited for their revelation that little difference in the quality of education was made through their proposal or use. The current status of teacher education is viewed as poorly conceived in its theory, contradictory in its components, and inconclusive in any of its practical results. Teacher education units are perceived as bureaucratic and only marginally concerned with the populations they supposedly serve, and the estrangement between theory and practice, university and public school, is viewed as irremediable. The proposal for a "new school" of teacher education is made, envisioning the utilization of present resources to construct institutions where teacher educators and teachers (both preservice and inservice) function together in a learning-teaching continuum, with the primary goal of both groups being the education of pupils. Budget, staff, facilities, research--all facets of the new institutional role--will reflect an equivalent concern for the education of children and the education of teachers. (ME)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED141356

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EDUCATING TEACHERS FOR THE 1980'S:

TOWARD A NEW SCHOOL*

Joe L. Frost

The University of Texas at Austin

There are some who claim to have the mysterious power of predicting the future. I have personally seen no acceptable evidence of this and claim for myself no mystical ability beyond considerable accuracy in witching for water. Predicting the course of human events and social institutions is considerably more complex and less certain than finding water with a stick.

The perils of prophesy and predicting lead me to retrench, lower my sights from the lofty and mystical to the real world of the possible. I intend simply to speculate about the present state of teacher education in respect to the problems of society at large; I intend to reflect on available knowledge from research and theory; I will share my conceptions of the way things are in teacher education, and finally, I will propose a new school for the 1980's. Speculating, reflecting, sharing and proposing seem considerably less hazardous than predicting, particularly in the presence of our esteemed panel of experts.

Education and Society

During the Viet Nam conflict this country, indeed the entire free world, saw a new conscience emerging. It was a conscience born in reaction against an

SP011 251

* Keynote address, Association of Teacher Education, Atlanta, Georgia, January 31, 1977.

ever-growing, impersonal industrial system and a spreading denial of moral idealism. It was manifested initially in the hearts and actions of the young, those who had time and cause for reflection about the loneliness of latch-key or TV living and the personal consequences of a tragic war. It took assassinations, Watergate, sinning senators, Lockheed, and five-hour specials on "What will you say to a hungry world?" to convince their elders that something was painfully wrong with a system whose most honored officials callously disregarded the most treasured and universal principles of moral conduct. Something was sordidly imbalanced in a society where one nation wasted more food and energy than it used and another tottered on the brink of starvation and hopelessness.

The lessons we learned from the 1950's and 1960's were both moral, representing the human spirit, and scientific, representing the human intellect. The period preceding the Viet Nam war was one of narrow-minded loyalty and faith in science. This blind obedience to the human intellect was manifest in family, industry, and business, but particularly in the school for the school has historically mirrored society's ideals and influenced them only indirectly or belatedly.

The industrial goal of this period was turning out products for a materialistic society and doing so as efficiently as possible. This goal dovetailed quite nicely with that of the citizenry--to accumulate, to consume, even to hoard products en-route to the "good life." Schools, true to tradition and unaccustomed to the fruits of materialism turned rather to its methods, which had worked so remarkably in industry if not in war. Namely, the computer tool, the systems approach, the efficiency model. Given this remarkable

innovation of the 1950's, along with the Sputnik induced scientific curriculum, schools ostensibly had an open door to excellence. But the lesson of Viet Nam in the sixties was retaught by Washington in the seventies and will remain to haunt us in the schools of the eighties. Man cannot live by science alone. He is a living, breathing, feeling being. The technological wrath of the world's richest nation could not subdue the human spirit and will of a small, underdeveloped country. The most powerful leaders on earth could not with immunity substitute wheeling-dealing for fundamental moral virtues.

Our political system is on the mend, and citizens are turning their attention to the errors of their schools. But revitalizing the schools is, unfortunately, not as simple as voting out the old and voting in the new. Educators are by tradition and decree tenured servants. The clientele must literally live and die with them. No one comes forth in great pomp and circumstance to take over the reins of schools as in government to create new policies and programs in wholesale fashion. Rather the pace is slow and halting, almost maddening to the creative and inspired.

Not having the power to turn the rascals out, the citizens cry "back to the basics," but there is no centralized focus, no organized effort, for they lack the insights and mechanisms to explore the real issues. It does not seem to be commonly understood that the health of governments, of nations and of societies, indeed of families, greatly influences the health of schools. The moral ideals, the motivations, the aspirations, the achievements and vitality of a society are reflected there.

The values of our society are now such that the very fabric of our most honored and influential institution, the family, is threatened. Divorces increased 700 percent over the past century to reach a record 1,000,000 plus in

1975. One third of American families have a single parent. Now for the first time most mothers of pre-school children work full-time outside the home. In Washington, D.C. last year more children were born out of wedlock than in married families. There were more abortions than births and more teen-agers gave birth than did post teen-agers.

Television is increasingly substituting for parenting, occupying more of the child's time than either parents or teachers. Fifty separate studies involving 10,000 children all show that TV violence breeds aggressive behavior in children. In one study almost half of the four to six year old children said they liked TV better than their Daddies. And if we can believe Ann Landers the feeling is mutual. When she asked her readers to respond to the question, "If you had it to do all over again would you have children?" seventy percent of the 10,000 responding said "no."

There is no single cause or solution to such problems but the most obvious answer was given this month by one of the researchers in a six-year study in Illinois who reported a "near-vacuum of morality" among the 3,000 teen-age subjects. The "back to basics" proponents should note that this morality vacuum was "enclosed by the perimeter of an edict to achieve." "Anything that jeopardizes their teenagers' occupational future is bad. The rest really doesn't matter."

Compared to the influence of family and peer forces, that of the school is quite limited. I am not indulging in the careless assumption that schooling makes no difference. Schooled individuals within a society are clearly more capable of certain forms of thought and performance than are unschooled individuals. The real issues are whether schooling can be expected to compensate for moral vacuums in families, whether schools can realistically take on a larger share of the socialization process than is presently assumed and whether the nature, quality

and rate of school achievement can be improved by changing the school.

Earlier this month (January, 1977) the American Institutes for Research released a report on the effects of educational innovations of the past twenty years. None of the innovations, team teaching, democratic procedures, volunteer aides, individualization of instruction, open classrooms, made much difference. Neither the back to basics types, the traditionalists, nor the drastic innovators, the radicals, can find comfort in this conclusion because the small differences that were found favored moderate innovation over no innovation and wholesale innovation.

I bring this study into discussion because such studies have considerable relevance to the issues at hand. The most fundamental test of teaching, of educating for teaching, is the effects of teaching on children. Wholesale failure of educational innovations reflects upon our system of preparing teachers. It suggests that what teacher educators are doing is wrong. But the real aggravation is the implication that we don't know any better, that we are stupid, when in fact we have known all along that what is thought about and talked about in the hallowed halls of universities is rarely applied in classrooms for children. A brief examination of some recent events illustrates this point.

There have been two great waves of educational innovation during the past two decades. The first was stimulated by Sputnik in 1957 and the second by the "war on poverty" in the mid-sixties. Before the structure and inqu ry emphasis of the first was spent, researchers had already revealed a wide gulf between promise and practice. Goodlad and associates conducted first hand observations in 260 classrooms with a nationwide geographical spread, many claiming to be engaged in innovative practices. The result was that the innovations claimed did not exist in any recognizable form. There was much sound and fury but innovation was left hanging on the classroom door.

Now, following the second great wave of innovation a similar pattern is evident. Proposals are written, grants are approved, teachers and administrators jump through hoops, the classrooms buzz with excitement when the consultants and auditors visit, then normalcy reigns until the next round. One example is the bilingual programs of the Southwest. Doctoral students, less conspicuous than federal agents and university professors, search vainly in their dissertation research to locate the innovative features alluded to in programmatic descriptions. Collectively, such studies say that we don't know how successful innovation is because it hasn't been tried, certainly not in the systematic fashion required to obtain reliable conclusions on which to base future practice.

The State of Teacher Education

The examination of schools for children provide one level of understanding about the education of teachers. The examination of schools for teachers provides another. Our study (University of Texas) of teacher education occupied about one-fourth time of five professors over two years. We reviewed research, visited promising programs around the country and solicited descriptions from other programs. We prepared the expected set of conclusions and recommendations in the final report. My personal appraisal is that teacher education research is in an infant state. Much of it is poorly conceived, contradictory and inconclusive. I agree with the popular conclusion that we cannot now identify any singular variable that will signal improvement in the quality of education nor can we identify a single reliable teacher education model to emulate. For most major decisions we remain at an experiential/feelings level. I do not reject feelings as one level of understanding. I've come to have greater faith in personal observations and feelings over the years.

Feelings are a barometer for the entire range of human intuitions, inspirations, experiences and knowledge. The better we build people the more confidence we can place in their feelings. I do not understand how any of the present accountability schemes can substitute for this. During the past decade I have visited over one hundred university campuses. Three of these teacher education programs created in me a sense of excitement. I doubt if either of the first two would have been outstanding on any common test of accountability. One gave no written tests or grades. The other made class attendance optional and encouraged their students to play with children most of the day. Although I didn't agree with many elements of the third program it was exciting to see the dedication, cooperation and enthusiasm of a team who had common goals and were working together to achieve them.

Many Universities, grown beyond managable proportions, are bureaucratic jungles bent upon "academic excellence" and only marginally concerned with the students they serve. Consider the newspaper report (December, 1976) of the annual promotion conference between the presidents and deans of a major university. One dean described the unprecedented tightening-up on promotions as a "blood bath." Another said that in many institutions around the country that unless someone resigns or dies there are no promotions. Yet another stated, "It wrecks the hell out of morale." The conclusion was that standards are getting higher, that toughness breeds quality. The ultimate conclusion of this trend of events is that the best universities would hire few and reward none. The fortunate ones with jobs exhaust their energy attempting to determine and pursue the most important criteria for advancement. Contrary to expressed intentions teaching is rarely

high on the list, particularly at large universities. Cooperation, essential to good programs, suffers, because credit goes to the program director and a single program can only support one or two directors. Consequently, innovative programs tend to be short-term, weak on talent, and divorced from the mainstream of the institution's regular teacher education activities.

Continuity, also essential to quality education, is virtually nonexistent for program planning is of low priority and professors must use all available time seeking grants, writing papers and books and traveling to workshops and conventions. They may very well know how to teach and develop good programs. They may in fact be superior teachers during the limited time they spend with students, but survival comes first.

The simple fact is that neither universities or public schools can educate teachers under present circumstances. Bureaucracy, born of the efficiency cult and made harsh by humans serving self over others is a central reason and there are several related ones.

There is an intellectual estrangement between public schools where prospective teachers practice and the universities from which they receive most of their training. This is not to say that they are locked in ideological or political combat for indeed many schools and universities are fairly consistent in their beliefs about the general nature and implementation of good teaching for children and make genuine efforts to cooperate. Schools stress teaching children. Universities stress teaching teachers. Although related these are not the same thing. Public schools and universities have different leaders, different goals, practices, and clientele. They are not organized in the same way. Their faculties do not have equivalent in kind skills. We can give up the lofty dream that these two bureaucratic giants, the public schools and the universities, will resolve the subtle and overt differences that effectively negate quality teacher preparation.

Toward A New School

I have a proposal for improving teacher and child education, not dramatic or utopian like the call to "deschool society," yet one with the capacity to transform the schools of the eighties and the simplicity to implement now. It can be done with present resources, it will require political maneuvering, it does not require new knowledge, it requires the will to do so. I have no great expectations that we will get it during the eighties but what we need is a new school, call it what you will, place it where you want, that has one unified goal to justify its existence, the education of children and those who would teach them. There must be no distinction in this institution between the responsibility to prepare prospective teachers and the responsibility to continue their preparation for so long as they teach ; No inequality of effort between educating teachers and educating children ; No estrangement between research and practice. There must be no separate bureaucracies, one which says this is my responsibility and that is yours, rather, they must say, the total responsibility is ours.

Just in case my simple plan for a new school is accepted, I will describe how it might appear by the end of the eighties. The university will continue to offer general education. I have no argument against the placement of this responsibility with the university or the need for such study. The new school will not be oblivious to the need for life-long study of man and his institutions but its major role for adults will be preparing to teach. Its budget will reflect an equivalent concern for the education of children and the education of teachers. Its professional staff will be recognized for their contributions to teaching but will not be limited experientially to training in pedagogy. The new school will bring children, prospective teachers, experienced

teachers, teacher trainers, theorists and researchers together, geographically and in terms of purpose. It will be small enough for personal warmth and cohesiveness but linked conceptually to other such institutions and to cooperating community institutions. The professional activities of teaching, theorizing and researching will all be conducted with common subjects, for example, child research with the institution's children, and teacher research with its teachers. The tangible products of such inquiry, while identified with individuals, will be the intellectual property of all the people in the school, its children, parents, teachers and other professionals.

I am not speaking of a glorified laboratory school that admits only special kids and serves limited functions, nor am I promoting the current "teacher center" concept in public schools. The new school might indeed use existing public school, university, or community facilities, but there would be no subtle discriminatory practices that favor one group over another. The new school would be <u>one</u> unified community body, the present teacher center is two or more.

Everyone is a student in the new school and everyone is a teacher. The curriculum focus will be on real problems with real people. Most of the current lecture and micro-teaching will be replaced with real problems with kids. I prefer real ice cream to imitation. The selection of the leader will be a critical decision. He/she will be one of the rare breed, capable of compassionate, skillful interaction with people of all ages yet visionary and skilled in conceptualizing new directions. His professional training will be equivalent to the present PhD level and his financial rewards will exceed those of the average university professor. He will direct a research-teaching team of high level professionals. More than ample supply of such people are already available.

The prospective teacher will spend a minimum of two years in the new school. Each regular teacher will team with two prospective teachers, one first year and one second year, who will spend at least half of their time in actual classroom practice. The regular teachers will teach two-third time and study and plan one-third. All study and planning will involve both regular teachers and prospective teachers on a staggered basis allowing a second year prospective teacher, a regular teacher or a certified teacher aide to be with the children at all times.

A common on-site training team working full-time within the school will be responsible for conducting training which will include actual demonstrations with children and specialized teaching of children with learning difficulties. Vacant positions will be filled with the most capable prospective teachers already working within the school / following the two year period of opportunities for direct observation of their capabilities. The entire staff will assist in the selection and induction process.

The new school will be no more expensive to operate than traditional schools because the resources typically provided by universities and public schools (financial, human and material) for separate purposes will be combined for a common purpose. Second year prospective teachers will supply an additional bonus by assuming legitimate teaching responsibilities. For this they may be paid a token salary. There will be no financial inducements for regular teachers working with prospective teachers; no / such policies that discriminate against any professional group in the school. Preparing teachers is everyone's responsibility; educating children is everyone's responsibility; seeking new knowledge by cooperating in research is everyone's responsibility.

The physical space for the new school / will be dictated by availability. University space and public school space will be freed by transfer of responsibilities and possible declines or shifts in enrollment. This should

present no unmanageable problem since all the parties required for the new school are now in facilities. Additional space will become available as community agencies take on greater responsibilities for the education of the young. Shared occupancy will ease cost factors and improve the coordination of services.

Creative playscapes and environmental centers will come to be recognized as one viable substitute for the debilitating, deadening effects of overexposure to television and underexposure to sensitive adults. These will be spread throughout communities, available for all ages, with sensitive supervisors to assist and counsel. Prospective teachers will be prepared for such roles in the school related outdoor centers and some will later be employed as play leaders.

The conditions for positive socio-emotional growth will be enhanced in the new school. The misplaced American notion of self-concept--striving for self--will be tempered with the democratic ideal of mutual sharing and the oriental ethic of respect for others. In other words other-concept will gradually replace self-concept as a goal of affective education. This transition will be aided by assisting children from the early years onward to participate in the adult world of work to assume productive activity in the community, to learn by doing and to contribute to the mutual welfare. The sharing of responsibilities for teaching with parents, ministers, lawyers, artists and others will add greater depth and relevance to education and will relieve the school of the requirement to over-generalize or spread itself thin.

There will be no reduction in the emphasis on skill mastery in the new school. Rather, for the first time in America there will be a sense of continuity for either prospective teachers or children.

in the task. The aspiring teacher of reading is taught by his professor that reading is "an audio-visual, verbal-processing skill of symbolic reasoning, sustained by the interfacilitations of an intricate hierarchy of substitute factors . . . mobilized as a psychological working system" (Holmes). In student teaching he is told that reading is a reader, a workbook and three groups of kids. Kids show the neophyte teacher that they don't care about either definition. There is no genuine imperative for the principals in this drama, the professor and the teacher, to resolve such discrepancies for their contacts are fleeting and each is responsive to his own motivations. The principal actors in each new school will have common and clearly defined goals. There will, of course, be diversity within each school and even greater diversity across schools but each will conceptualize its methods through cooperative effort and make them better by continuing analysis and refinement.

The common methods madness now prevalent in universities will be replaced. Presently, the math professor lectures on his own personal predilections about planning, motivating, grouping, diagnosing, questioning, instructing, and evaluating, to be followed by the science prof, the reading prof, the social studies prof and an assortment of others. Each is oblivious to the intent or content of the other's lectures, each believes that his lectures have divine origin, neither trusts his colleague to do it right so the student does it over and over again. Only the subject content is changed; the instructional processes remain the same.

The new school will not be a "behavior analysis school," a "cognitive school," a "humanistic school" or an "academic school." The results of inquiry into models of curriculum are available to all professionals. There is no universally superior model. Those who give their allegiance to models over

people misunderstand both research results and the practices that produce them. They ignore the lessons of history and they miss the meaning of our philosophers.

In respect to comparisons between his own developmental theory and the stimulus response schema, Piaget stated:

> . . . while I won't say it is false, (it) is in any case entirely incapable of explaining cognitive learning . . . it (Piaget's developmental theory) is indeed a stimulus-response theory, if you will, but first you add operations and then add equilibration (Piaget Rediscovered, pp. 15, 19).

And Abraham Maslow, the father of humanistic psychology, said:

> It is very difficult, I have found, to communicate to others my simultaneous respect for and impatience with these two comprehensive psychologies (psychoanalysis and behaviorism). So many people insist on being either pro-Freudian or anti-Freudian, pro-scientific or anti-scientific psychology, etc. In my opinion all such loyalty positions are silly. Our job is to integrate these various truths into the whole truth, which should be our only loyalty (Motivation and Personality, p. 3).

Education has no theoretical theory of its own and looks to philosophy and psychology for its roots. The new school must avoid the temptation to seek notoriety through allegiance to fleeting loyalty positions. In education as in psychology, knowledge is never finished. We seek, we test, we set aside, we revise and we seek again.

Two currently opposing educational ideologies, competency based education (CBE) and open education illustrate these points. Neither side will be satisfied with my explanation but consider the arguments. The only clear distinguishing element in CBE is the emphasis upon observable behavior, usually stated as "behavioral objectives." The array of additional characteristics (field orientation, team teaching, etc.) are related practices that serve no distinguishing functions. They can be part of any program.

Similarly, there is no operational definition of open education that sets it apart from all other forms of schooling. Open educators describe CBE as a behavioral approach that views the person as a passive, receptive organism,

essentially a creature of his environment, primarily responsive to cues or stimuli to initiate behavior and reinforcement to ensure its repetition. Its application, they say, will result in rigid, uninspired, dehumanizing schools.

The CBE educators believe that the open educators are as rigid in their own views as those they react against. They are seen as overly sentimental and non-scientific, depending upon feelings, intuition, and slipshod thinking for their sources of energy and practice.

John Dewey faced this same dilemma over a half century ago when the traditionalists and the progressives were at odds.

> Thus sects arrive: schools of opinion. Each selects that set of conditions that appeals to it; and then erects them into a complete and independent truth; instead of treating them as a factor in a problem, needing adjustment (The Child and the Curriculum, p. 4).

Let me make it clear that the road sought is not the middle one, but the right one. It is foolish and utopian to exhaust our energies through blind loyalty to a single ideology for none is sufficiently developed or sufficiently comprehensive to reconcile the multiple complexities of schooling and the dynamic facets of human development.

This generation of educators, first in the history of mankind, has the powerful tools of science and the fruits of space-age technology at its disposal. But useful as they are they cannot substitute for the ageless moral idealism that holds civilization and societies and schools together.

Although I cannot be sure that the changes that I propose will come, I am confident that the present system of educating teachers cannot remain intact indefinitely. There are too many glaring weaknesses. History will judge us harshly for our enduring faith in the misplaced promise of a normative school that step-grades people of all ages like eggs going to market; for building unyielding

bureaucracies in education that divorce theory from practice, training from experience, and technique from morality. Organization and skills are important but people are more important.

Perhaps the clearest expression of my intent are the simple words of my former colleague, William Arrowsmith: "It is men we need." In our present system, one can go all the way from kindergarten through the university without meeting a man or woman whose chief aim is to live and model a life in service to others, a man or woman who gives a boy or girl the only motivation of universal merit--to become a man--to become a woman. It is how one lives his life in respect to others that counts--and that is precisely what Americans, jaded from pursuit of the materialistic dream and bewildered from failure to find it, are beginning to realize. And that is the principal foundation upon which the new school must be built.